



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 April 2023

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/23/3315203

100 Priory Way, Kirklees WF14 9EF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr D Knibbs against the decision of Kirklees Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/62/93054/E, dated 14 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey side and single storey rear extensions, associated internal and external works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council has raised no issue with regard to the proposed single storey rear extension. I have no reason to disagree with that view, and I have, therefore, restricted my consideration to the proposed two-storey side extension.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed two-storey side extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. No.100 Priory Way (No.100) is a late 1960s detached chalet style dwelling located on a corner plot fronting Priory Way. The proposal is for a two-storey extension to the flank elevation of No.100, which would project around 3.6m into the existing garden which wraps around the side of the dwelling along its frontage with Farrar Drive.
5. Policy LP24(c) of the Kirklees Local Plan (2019) (KLP) indicates that development proposals should promote good design by ensuring that, amongst other things, extensions are subservient to the original building. The Council's *House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document* (2021) (SPD) also indicates that on corner plots, side extensions should be considered as both side and front extensions and as such will relate to both street frontages. SPD paragraph 5.23 requires, on corner plots, that side extensions face in both directions; be set back from the existing building line on both

- streets; and follow the boundary treatment in relation to its position, height and materials.
6. The existing flank elevation of No.100 broadly aligns with the front elevation of No.35 Farrar Drive (No.35) to the north and the proposed extension would extend beyond this established building line. Although inconsistent with the SPD guidance in this regard, the rear building line of No.100 is around 22m from No.35, separated by the rear garden (of No.100) and an electricity substation. I also observed on site that the building line of dwellings on Farrar Drive sweeps to the north-west as it rises from Priory Walk. Because of this, and the separation distance, I find this is a corner that could accommodate change and I do not find that the width of the extension, in isolation, would be obtrusive in the streetscene. Nor would it detract from the open character of the corner of Priory Walk and Farrar Drive. I further have no concerns regarding the size of the resulting footprint of the dwelling relative to its plot; the garden to the front, side and rear of No.100 would remain reasonably generous and comparable to other dwellings in the area.
 7. The SPD guidance is that two-storey side extensions should ideally be visually smaller in relation to the original house; and be set back at least 500mm from the front with the ridgeline of the roof lowered. The proposed side extension would be offset from the front elevation of No.100 by 500mm, but, at odds with the SPD guidance, it would extend the existing ridge of the host dwelling to a flank gable facing Farrar Drive. The eaves of the proposed roof would be much higher than the existing, introducing a true first floor within the chalet dwelling. Whilst the proposed extension may be of an architectural style which is contemporary and of its time, the continuation of the ridgeline, in combination with its width and eaves height, means it would dominate the host dwelling, failing to appear visually smaller or subservient to it. The front gable detailing to the new first floor window, although slightly lower than the main ridge, only serves to emphasise the height and massing of the proposed extension rather than echoing or complementing the existing front gable.
 8. I recognise that the appeal site is within an established residential area and that numerous dwellings have been extended over the years. I observed on my site visit that there is some variation in the material, styles and detailing of later additions, but noted that this part of Priory Way has retained the chalet dwelling design, with steep pitched facing gables and low eaves, many accommodating dormer extensions. The scale and design of the proposed extension would appear incongruous within this context to the detriment of the existing street scene.
 9. No.98 Priory Way (No.98), on the opposite corner of Priory Way and Farrar Drive, has been extended to the side with a gable facing Farrar Drive. Although that gable also extends the existing ridgeline, it has a steep pitch with low eaves, similar to the principal elevation, with a front dormer. This minimises the massing of the extension to both Priory Way and Farrar Drive, retaining the characteristic appearance of a chalet dwelling. In contrast, the eaves height and shallow pitch of the proposed facing gable to No.100 would result in a bulky flank elevation to Farrar Drive, increasing the prominence of the extension.
 10. The appellant has referred in evidence to numerous examples of extensions allowed in the area, where the ridgeline of the host dwelling has been

continued. I have, however, been provided with very limited information about these extensions to enable me to ascertain whether they are directly comparable to the appeal proposal before me, or whether they pre-date the KLP or the current SPD which was adopted in June 2021. I have, therefore, considered the appeal proposal on its own merits and the specific circumstances of the appeal site and streetscene.

11. Consequently, I conclude on the main issue that the proposed two-storey side extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area. It therefore conflicts with KLP Policy 24(c), parts of the SPD guidance, and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). Together, these promote good design by ensuring that proposals respect and enhance local character; and that house extensions enhance the appearance of an area and are subservient to the original building.

Conclusions

12. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR